DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 115 191 HE 007 095

AUTHOR McKee, Helen C.; And Others
TITLE Graduate Degree Survey. Overview of Five Year Population (1969-1974).
INSTITUTION State Univ. of New York, Fredonia. Coll. at Fredonia. Teacher Education Research Center.
PUB DATE Oct 75
NOTE 51p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS College Environment; Economic Factors; *Enrollment Influences; *Graduate Study; *Higher Education; *Masters Degrees; *School Surveys; Student Motivation; Student Opinion; Time Perspective

ABSTRACT

The Graduate Degree Survey was deisgned to ascertain graduates' reactions to master's degree programs at Fredonia, to discover the types of students who enroll for advanced work, the fields of interest, and the time lapse between completion of the undergraduate degree and when the master's degree program was started. Incentive for enrolling, years spent in securing the degree, life-styles, distances, traveled for course work, and involvement in campus-community life were all factors that were considered in the Graduate Survey. Open-ended items were included to encourage the respondents to express their ideas freely and candidly. Tables and appendices are included. (Author/KE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED115191

GRADUATE DEGREE SURVEY

OVERVIEW

of

FIVE YEAR POPULATION
(1969 - 1974)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Helen C. McKee
Daniel J. Bauman
Gerald T. Holmes

Teacher Education Research Center
State University College
Fredonia, New York

October 1975

HE 007 095

HIGHLIGHTS

Housing was not a concern to 81% of the population and 83% were not interested in housing personnel aid.

There were one quarter (25%) who had graduate assistantships....and four-fifths (80%) felt that they had received an accurate job description.

Upon completion of the degree requirements, over three-fourths (78%) received a salary adjustment.

New interests and ideas were developed from course material by 83% of the respondents. Four-fifths (80%) of the respondents used this material to their advantage.

There were over two-thirds (68%) who have enrolled, or will enroll, for further course work. Of this percentage, there are 35% who will enroll at Fredonia.

The curriculum area (for both degrees) remained constant for over four-fifths (84%) of the population under study.

Almost three-quarters (73%) of the Fredonia graduates requested copies of the findings.

Extracurricular college activities were not of importance to three-quarters (75%) of the respondents.

Cost factors were of major consideration to two-thirds (67%) of the population.

Proximity of the college was considered a major influence by over three-fourths (77%) of the respondents.

Publications of professors in their curriculum areas were not of importance to 97% of the respondents.

Almost four-fifths (79%) of the respondents indicated that library facilities were good compared with other colleges. Library facilities were considered excellent by over one-third (37%) of the population.

Two-thirds (65%) frequently used library material for course enrichment.

Over four-fifths (83%) indicated library facilities were available frequently.

The library was frequently used for class participation (70% of the graduates).

Three-quarters (75%) indicated that library materials were frequently sufficient.

Table of Contents

		Page
Foreword		i
Introduction		ii
Chapter I	Population Poll	1
Chapter II	The Choice Was Fredonia	5
Chapter III	Reactions to Educational Programs	10
Chapter IV	Professional Growth	19
Chapter V	Graduate Comments	25
Chapter VI	Retrospect	30
Appendix A	Entry Conditions for Undergraduate Degree Programs not Specifically Identified	32
Appendix B	Colleges, Other Than Fredonia, Attended for Undergraduate Degree	33
Appendix C	Graduate Degree Information Form, 1975	36

Foreword

Graduate-Degree Survey was initiated as a natural sequel to SURVEY - '71, which was a study of graduates' perceptions of the undergraduate degree from SUC, Fredonia, in 1971. This survey of graduate students from 1970-1974 was designed to ascertain perceptions of programs, course offerings, and the major fields of the target group. Views of educational experiences, activities. interests, influential persons encountered, problem areas, as well as suggestions and criticisms were sought through the use of a 74-item questionnaire which included three open-end sections.

The investigators are most appreciative of the help and encouragement provided by President Dallas K. Beal; Dr. Morgan D. Dowd, Dean for Graduate Studies and Research, and his office staff; Dr. Ronald E. Hull, Acting Director of Teacher Education Research Center; the Alumni Office and staff for assistance and cooperation; and to Mrs. Gertrude Reep, secretary, who contributed greatly to the development of the report by categorizing responses as they were received. Mrs. Marian Anderon, secretary, assumed the final typing assignment. We appreciate her efforts.

A very special note of appreciation must be extended to those graduate students who took the time from busy schedules and made the effort to respond. Without their concern for the future of SUC, Fredonia, the report could not have become a reality! Thanks to each and every one of you.

Helen C. McKee
Daniel Bauman
Gerald T. Holmes

Introduction

Improvement of instruction continues to be a major goal of the professional staff and administration at State University of New York at Fredonia.

The Graduate Degree Survey was designed to ascertain graduates' reactions to master-degree programs at Fredonia, to discover the types of students who enrolled for advanced work, the fields of interest, and the time lapse between completion of the undergraduate degree and when the master's degree program was started. Incentives for enrolling, years spent in securing the degree, life-styles, distances traveled for course work, and involvement in campus-community life were all factors which were considered in the Graduate Survey. Open-ended items were included to encourage the respondents to express their ideas freely and candidly.

Inasmuch as the undergraduate study, SURVEY - '71, provided useful information, it was decided to use a similar format for this graduate study. Discussions with graduate students revealed several concerns. Therefore, an effort was made to provide opportunities for the target group to react freely and candidly to forced-choice and open-end items.

A cover letter by Dr. Dallas K. Beal, President, State University College at Fredonia, indicated institutional support and probably influenced the high percentage of responses which were received. The first mailing netted 329 (47%) response. The second mailing and personal contacts netted 143 (20%) return for a total of 472 (67%). All advanced-degree graduates (N = 708) of the last five years (December 1969-June 1974) comprised the population.

Since there was no significant difference between the respondent and non-respondent groups in major field of study, sex, or year in which the degree was awarded, we can be reasonably confident that the respondent group is truly representative of the population.

When one-third of the questionnaires had been returned, a preliminary analysis was prepared to provide special information for a visitation of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). This interim report, viz., Graduate Degree Survey Preliminary Report, had limited distribution.

Data for this study were analyzed using computer program FORTAP. Several items were hand tallied to verify the accuracy of the computer processing. In reference to percentages as they appear in the tables, it should be noted that all percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

The format of this report closely follows the sequence of the questionnaire which followed a logical progression of events in a graduate student's life. The Highlights section includes items and percentages which seemed relevant and of special interest.

Chapter 1

Population Poll

Who is attracted to SUC, Fredonia, for the graduate degree?

Background of Population

The State University College at Fredonia attracted a relatively young population. A large segment of the graduates (75%) in the master's degree programs during the last five years (N - 472) enrolled for the undergraduate degree directly from high school. Table 1 indicates that "delayed entrants" accounted for a much smaller group (7%) who were enrolled in degree programs.

Table 1. Entry Dates for the Undergraduate Program

Item #1: Categories for Time of Entry	Percent
Directly from High School	75
"Delayed" Entrant	7
Community-college Transfer	4
Community-college Graduate	5
Armed-services Veteran	1
*"Other"	4
No Response	2

*Appendix A, page 32, indicates "other" entry categories into the undergraduate program.

Colleges Where Undergraduate Degree Was Earned

The College at Fredonia was the degree-awarding institution for both the Bachelor's and Master's degrees earned by a majority (63%) of the population under consideration. Colleges outside the state were attended by more persons (18%) for the baccalaureate degree than those from other SUC units.[1] It is noted that there were several respondents from outside the continental United States. Most of these respondents were graduates of the Teacher Preparation Program. Table 2 includes all categories which were considered.

Table 2. Colleges Where Undergraduate Degree Was Earned

Item #2: Categories of Colleges	Percent
SUC, Fredonia	63
SUC, Another Unit	10
Private College in New York State	6
College, Out of State	18
College, Outside Continental U. S.	2
No Response	1

The College at Fredonia was "home" to a large portion (63%) of the undergraduate candidates. As graduate students, this group should have been aware of the college climate, rules, and regulations; therefore,

---

1. Appendix B, page 33, indicates where colleges, other than SUNY units, were located.

they should have been familiar with the college.

A majority (83%) of the respondents enrolled in a master's program within five years after completing the baccalaureate degree. Nearly half (48%) of the group entered within a year after completing the initial degree. Table 3 indicates the time lapse between degree programs.

Table 3. Time Lapse Between Degree Programs

Item #3: Categories of Enrollment for Master's Degree	Percent
Within a Year	48
1 - 5 Years Later	35
6 - 10 Years Later	8
11 - 14 Years Later	3
16 (or More) Years Later	5
No Response	1

Since the graduate population is relatively young, it might be helpful to provide opportunities for them with experienced persons of the various professions. The use of guest speakers, tangible models, and practical experience under real working conditions, if possible, are recommended.

Type of Area Where Respondents Live and Work

In what type of communities do SUC, Fredonia graduates live?

Do they work in the same type of area?

Educated in a small-town setting, approximately one-third of the

graduates now reside and work in a small city or town. Medium-sized cities attracted another group (21%) for residency and employment. The suburb of the medium-sized city attracted the smallest percentage (5%) for employment. Table 4 includes percentages for all areas under consideration.

Table 4. Categories of Residence and Employment Areas of Graduates

Categories	Residence	Employment
Items #4, 5: Areas Under Consideration	Percent	Percent
Rural Farm Area	19	18
Small City or Town of Fewer Than 10,000	32	33
Medium-sized City (up to 50,000)	21	19
Suburb of Medium-sized City	6	5
Large City (100,000 or Over)	8	9
Suburb of Large City	13	12
No Response	0	3

It appeared that the graduate population tended to live and work in a geographical setting similar to the college. The emerging profile indicates that the use of local community facilities and resources would have educational value for the Fredonia student body.

Chapter II

The Choice Was Fredonia

Why did students choose SUC, Fredonia, for the master's program?

College Selection

This section of the questionnaire contained items about college selection which were catergorized into three major areas: academic, informational, and monetary. Each area is considered independently.

What were the academic reasons for selecting Fredonia?

One of the major reasons the respondents elected to attend Fredonia was the strong program in their major field. A great majority (82%) of the target group listed this as influential in determining their college choice. Another large group (67%) considered "reputation of professors for quality education" as influential in their decision to attend SUC, Fredonia. Reasonable requirements for matriculation were a consideration for approximately three-fourths (77%) of the group.

Publications of professors within specific areas were relevant to only a few (3%) of those who were surveyed. Pertinent comments were:

> I feel that Fredonia's quality of teaching - in general - has deteriorated since it adopted the policy that all its faculty must have or be working on a doctorate....a fine teacher's ability does not rest solely on his or her research and writing ability (respondent #2-246-435-11).

> Faculty publications and success of recent undergraduates in other graduate programs is beginning to put Geology Department on the map. (respondent #1-684-319-43).

Items on academic reasons for college selection are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. College Selection

Item E, 6-10, 22-24	Percent			
Academic Factors	Major Influence	Minor Influence	Not Relevant	No Response
Strong Program in Major Areas	51	31	18	0
Publications of Professors in Area	3	19	77	1
Reputation of Professors for Quality Education	29	38	32	0
Variety of Teaching Techniques Used	11	38	51	0
Credentials of Professors	18	40	42	1
Requirements for Matriculation Were Reasonable	42	35	22	1
Extensive Physical Facilities Were Available	12	35	32	1
Experience in Fredonia Undergraduate Program	45	13	42	1

What types of informational feedback enticed graduates to Fredonia?

This section dealt with sources of information pertaining to the public relation's aspect of SUC, Fredonia. Recommendations of Alumni, reputation of Alumni, contacts with SUC, Fredonia representatives, attitudes of peers, and the number of peers who were attending Fredonia were included in this segment of the questionnaire.

Media articles about SUC, Fredonia, were of a major influence to only a very few (3%) of the respondents while family recommendations were of a major influence to only (10%) of those questioned. Professional reputations of Alumni were a major influence on the largest number (20%) of the target group. It appears that there was not any one instructionally-related item which was an outstanding influence on the decision of graduates to seek the advanced degree at Fredonia. Table 6 includes the informational reasons for selecting Fredonia.

Table 6. Informational Reasons for Attending Fredonia

Item E, 11-17	Percent			
Informational Factors	Major Influence	Minor Influence	Not Relevant	No Response
Recommendations of Alumni	17	25	57	1
Professional Reputation of SUC, Fredonia, Alumni	20	35	44	1
Contacts with Representatives of SUC, Fredonia	19	24	56	0
Media Articles or Publications about SUC, Fredonia	3	24	73	0
Attitudes of Peers Towards SUC, Fredonia	15	41	43	1
Number of Peers Who Attended SUC, Fredonia	16	33	50	1
Family Recommendations	10	20	69	1

Reasons for selecting Fredonia were practical....it was nearby and inexpensive. A strong program in a specific field was also a major influence. The caliber of education available in all departments should be continually upgraded so these qualities can be known through Alumni, professionals, and peers.

What influence did the cost factors have on students?

An overwhelming number of the master's degree graduates selected SUC, Fredonia, for two reasons. The proximity of the college was a major influence to over three-quarters (77%) of the respondents. Cost factors were a major influence for over four-fifths (88%) of the graduates.

One-third (33%) of the respondents were influenced by the possibility of graduate assistantships, while another segment (45%) considered the availability of waivers as influential. Table 7 indicates monetary considerations.

Table 7. College Selection--Monetary

Item E, 18-21	Percent			
Monetary Concerns	Major Influence	Minor Influence	Not Relevant	No Response
Proximity of College	77	8	14	0
Cost Factors	67	21	12	1
Availability of Waivers/Vouchers	28	17	55	0
Possibility of Graduate Assistantship(s)	22	11	66	0

It should be noted that one-quarter (25%) of the respondents were provided with graduate assistantships. They were satisfied with assistantships which were awarded for the most part. According to responses, four-fifths (80%) felt that their position was accurately described and three-fifths (60%) felt that they were adequately compensated. Table 8 indicates student reactions to the Graduate Assistantship Program.

Table 8. Graduate Assistantship Program

Item 54a, b: Graduate Assistantships	Percent	
	Yes	No
Assigned Graduate Assistantship	25	75
Job Description Accurate	20	5
Stipend Adequate	15	10

Economic conditions were generally important to the population. Assistantships should continue to have appeal. Any factors which could lower costs should be considered; scheduling required courses back-to back, aide programs, textbooks which could be used as "on-the-job" manuals, workshops, and courses offered off-campus.

Chapter III

Reactions to Educational Programs

What classroom experiences, materials, equipment, facilities, and services were significant in the educational program?

Reactions to classroom experiences were sought in a series of forced-choice response items which were divided into three categories: classroom experiences, materials and equipment, and curricular programs. Other topics considered in the section were social-cultural involvement and housing facilities.

Classroom Experiences

What classroom experiences did the group have?

Some of the respondents felt that there was classroom participation "frequently" (69%) and another group indicated classroom participation "occasionally" (30%). Practical knowledge was received "frequently" (53%) or "occasionally" (44%) according to a high percentage (97%) of the population. Frequent classroom discussion sessions were recalled by over three-fifths (64%) of the group under consideration, and another group (35%) remembered "occasional" discussion sessions. Lectures were an integral part of the educational process. One segment (54%) checked "frequent" lecture sessions and another group (44%) marked "occasional" lecture classes. Table 9 includes the complete breakdown.

Table 9. Frequency of Classroom Experiences for the Graduate Program

Categories	Percent			
SECTION F: Items 25-34: Educational Experiences during College Years	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Not Applicable
Professional Encouragement	45	48	6	1
Practical Knowledge	53	44	2	1
Theoretical Aspect of Subject	52	44	1	2
Variety of Learning Experiences	49	45	4	2
Guest Speakers	7	57	32	4
Class Participation	69	30	0	1
Lecture Sessions	54	44	1	0
Class Discussion	64	35	0	1
Meaningful Class Assignments	46	52	2	0
"Busy Work" Assignments	19	59	20	1

Obviously the College enjoyed the reputation of having a professional staff who were interested in providing practical knowledge, used a variety of learning experiences, and encouraged class participation.

In sharp contrast to these reactions was the fact that lecture sessions were frequently used (54%). One speculation is that lectures are expected in graduate courses with class discussions "frequently" (64%) accompanying them.

The possibilities for creative approaches seem endless. Guest speakers, practicums, observations, clinical approaches, and audio-visual aids, all offer the potential for greater student involvement in the teaching-learning process.

Materials and Equipment

What types of materials and equipment were utilized by students?

The target group responded favorably to the availability of library services for their graduate-degree years. Over four-fifths (83%) indicated that facilities of the Daniel Reed Library were "frequently" available when needed. One group of respondents (75%) felt that the library materials were usually sufficient for course requirements. Furthermore, most of the population (96%) found materials sufficient for course requirements. Audio-visual materials were used "occasionally" in class sessions according to three-fifths (63%) of the group while less than one-fifth (19%) said they were used "frequently."

The question on advisement or guidance services drew the lowest indication (39%) of satisfaction. Time may have played a major role in the response for this item. Most students did not attend classes until

late afternoon when the administrative and advisement offices were closed for the day. This minimized interaction between students and staff. Table 10 includes all indicators of educational support and enrichment.

Table 10. Enrichment and/or Support for Educational Experiences

Categories	Percent				
Items: 35-41 Categories Under Consideration	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Not Applicable	No Response
Use of Audio-visual Materials, Including Films	19	63	16	2	0
Availability of Library Facilities	83	14	0	2	0
Use of Library for Class Preparation	70	26	3	0	0
Sufficient Library Materials for Course Requirements	75	21	2	2	0
Sufficient Library Materials for Course Enrichment	65	29	2	3	1
Satisfaction with Administrative Services	34	50	11	4	1
Satisfaction with Guidance or Advisement Service	39	38	16	7	1

Table 11. Curricular Indicators for Degree Requirements

Categories	Percent				
Items: 42-46: Categories Being Considered	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Not Applicable	No Response
Variety of Course Offerings Per Semester	27	61	10	2	1
Hindered or Limited by Program Requirements for Degree	14	50	32	2	1
Attendance for Course Work During the Day	36	42	22	0	1
Enrollment in Off-campus Courses	4	18	71	6	1
Travel (Over 10 Miles) to Attend Sessions	49	6	43	1	1

The College campus was the center for all advanced degree work for a majority (71%) of the population. Experimental programs could be encouraged in this setting. If offered on campus, these experimental programs would be available to a majority of the students.

The Daniel Reed Library facilities were appreciated by most of the graduate student body. The respondents felt that it was well-stocked and had sufficient materials which were available when needed.

Comments about advisement and guidance service were less positive. Statements of the graduates were forceful and contained constructive criticisms. One response suggested:

> "Fredonia needs to improve itself in three administrative areas: (a) communication between students and administration--possibly more student-administrative dialogues, (b) Registrar's Office . . . the quality of advisement and lack of professionalism are two more examples, (c) the Placement Service is not efficient. It takes forever to send out credentials when requested." (respondent #1-169-045-43).

Curricular

What were the curricular program problems as perceived by the group under study?

Only a small segment (4%) of the population "frequently" took courses off-campus, while another group (18%) took off-campus courses "occasionally." The largest percentage (71%) never took courses away from the College. One group (36%) took courses "frequently" during the day.* One group (50%) felt "occasionally" hindered or limited by requirements of the degree program.

Table 11 gives a complete breakdown of responses on curricular items.

---

*Most of these courses were taken during summer sessions.

Who attended social activities on campus?

Social activities were generally unattended by graduate students. A variety of reasons were given. Among the reasons were:

1. most graduate classes are held at night and times conflicted with campus social activities.
2. many graduate students worked full time and found it difficult to attend.
3. driving distance was often a hinderance.

Comments which supported these statements were:

> I had to pay a student activity fee and was unable to attend any function on campus. Many of the graduate courses are at night. How can you be in two places at once? (respondent #2-24-035-43).
>
> Most times I traveled 150 miles after a day of teaching to a 7-10 class. (respondent #2-592-064-32).
>
> I feel that the mandatory student fee is very unfair for off-campus graduate students....many of whom never participate in any campus activities. We pay for others entertainment....Fredonia even offered a course in Salamanca (60 miles away) and collected the fee. (respondent #2-634-085-01).

Only one-fifth (21%) of the respondents were actively involved in extra-curricular college activities. One-tenth (10%) were active in a campus club. Over two-thirds (68%) of the master's candidates attended lectures at least "occasionally," although this may be partly the result of graduate course requirements. Table 12 lists information pertaining to social activities.

Table 12. Social Activities

Categories	Percent			
Items: 47-50 Categories for Social Involvement	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Not Applicable
Active Involvement in Extracurricular College Activities	7	14	75	4
Active Involvement in College Clubs	3	7	85	5
Attended Lectures/Seminars	16	53	29	2
Attended Campus-Sponsored Social Events	7	33	56	3

Activity fee charges should be reviewed. Perhaps other uses for the graduate fee would be more beneficial to the population.

Facilities

Were SUC, Fredonia facilities utilized by graduate students?

A great majority of the graduate students (80%) chose not to seek housing or food facilities on campus. Among the reasons for this are commuting, family conditions, and occupational commitments.

The few students who did avail themselves of the facilities were "campus bound": foreign students, graduate assistants, and students on campus for extended periods of time each day. Table 13 provides the information on available facilities.

Table 13. On-Campus Facilities

Categories	Percent			
Items: 51-53 Categories for Campus Living	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Not Applicable
Available Housing Adequate	10	6	2	81
Housing Personnel Helpful	7	7	3	83
Adequate Food Facilities	9	7	1	82

Housing and food facilities were used by a very small percentage (16%) of the target group. At least one-half of those who were "campus" residents were satisfied with accommodations.

If dormitory occupancy should be encouraged, a reserved section for graduate students might be an incentive to reside on campus.

Chapter IV

Professional Growth

Did the degree experiences promote changes?

How did Fredonia compare to other college campuses?

The great majority (83%) found that new ideas developed from the graduate experience; and, consistent with this, four-fifths (80%) found course materials useful in their professions. However, only one-quarter (25%) changed their professional position as a result of obtaining the master's degree. As previously stated, many (78%) of the respondents received a salary increase as a result of obtaining the advanced degree. Approximately one-half (46%) obtained a master's degree to meet the state mandate of 30 graduate hours within a five-year period.

Many respondents (68%) had already enrolled, or intended to enroll, for further course work. Of this group, over one-third (35%) indicated that SUC, Fredonia would be the college of their choice.

Table 14 indicates responses to professional growth. Also included in Section F was an open-end item which solicited comments on SUC, Fredonia's graduate program. Constructive comments were timely and based on personal experiences. Both Table 14 and samples of open-end comments follow.

Table 14. Professional Growth

Categories	Percent		
Items: 56-62 Status Changes	Yes	No	No Response
Change of Professional Position	25	72	3
Course Material Used to Advantage	80	17	3
New Ideas and Interests Developed	83	16	1
Enrolled for Further Course Work	68	31	1
Enrollment for Further Course Work at SUC, Fredonia	35	37	28
Enrollment for a Post-master's Degree	34	60	6
State Mandate was Main Reason for Obtaining Master's Degree	46	53	1
Earned Master's Degree in Same Area as Bachelor's	84	16	0

Examples of constructive comments are:

> Graduate Office lost my transcript resulting in semester delay of graduation. Advisors gave incomplete and inaccurate information concerning deadlines and requirements. (respondent #1-393-334-43).

> Possibly there could be an office made available to the night school or commuting student to handle problems (advisory or administrative) that could be open in the evening and a phone number listed. (respondent #2-680-071-11).

> All in all, I found my Master's work to be very helpful and practical for my present position. However, there was a limited number of courses offered in my major in the year span. (respondent #2-021-265-33).
>
> I think we in Chautauqua County are fortunate to have Fredonia College. I feel that it offers as good a program as any college in New York State. (respondent #2-148-412-03).

Fredonia remained the academic center for over one-third (35%) of the respondents. This group could be an invaluable source of information in recruitment efforts.

There was a section, following item 62, which was designed to ascertain reasons for changing academic majors between the undergraduate and the advanced degree. A large group (84%) earned the two degrees in the same area. Reasons for changes were varied and ranged from personal preference to economic necessity. Indicative of these responses were:

> Fredonia does not have a master's program in Psychology. (respondent #2-339-026-13).
>
> I like music better than my former specialty. (respondent #2-463-032-01).
>
> Elementary Education at my undergraduate college was not offered as a major....but only as "a field of emphasis." (respondent #2-024-035-43).
>
> B.A. in Secondary Ed. in Math. M.A. in Mathematics not Math. Ed. Reason for change was to acquire a broader-based degree and not to limit myself to a career in education. (respondent #2-257-043-13).
>
> New interests....long time in between. (respondent #2-504-073-12).
>
> Job requirements. (respondent #1-620-174-02).

From Physical Education to Elementary Education.... found teaching in the classroom to be more satisfying and more challenging. (respondent #2-392-180-12).

The assistantship was available and I, therefore, went into another field. I could not get an assistantship in my original course area. (respondent #2-563-322-32).

Because I worked in El. Ed., I became increasingly involved with reading problems. Thus I decided to obtain my degree in Dev. Reading. (respondent #2-379-379-13).

The only specific inducement mentioned for changing major fields for advanced degrees was graduate assistantships. Career opportunities seemed less important than personal interests. Other ways of building up or maintaining enrollment levels for departments should be considered.

Comparison of SUC, Fredonia, to Other Colleges.

There were three-quarters (75%) of the target group who attended Fredonia for both the baccalaureate and the master's degrees. Many respondents (77%) chose the SUNY unit because of proximity to home. Nevertheless, several of those who were surveyed (34%) had attended other colleges. Visitations to other college campuses provided the basis for comparison.

How did SUC, Fredonia, compare to other colleges?

The physical facilities at Fredonia (the condition of buildings and classrooms) were rated highly (excellent or good) by over four-fifths (87%) of the population.

The library was rated favorably (excellent or good) by the respondents (79%).

The comparison of tutorial assistance, which is shown in Table 15, may be misleading if the reader does not notice that there was a large portion who had no basis for comparison.

One group (41%) responded favorably to the quality of advisement; however, this was contradicted by another group (37%) who was less favorable in comparing SUC, Fredonia, to other colleges.

Table 15. Comparison Ratings of Comments

Categories	Percent					
Items: 63-74 Comparable Factors	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No Basis for Comparison	No Response
Condition of Buildings and Classrooms	45	42	3	0	9	0
Equipment Availability	27	47	10	1	15	0
Extracurricular Facilities	14	32	12	2	39	1
Job Placement of Graduates	9	23	15	6	46	1
Library Facilities	37	42	8	2	11	0
Quality of Academic Instruction	23	48	15	1	13	0
Quality of Advisement	14	27	22	15	22	1
Communication Flow	7	29	31	11	20	1
Tutorial Assistance	4	11	10	4	69	1
Reputation in Community	18	46	11	1	24	0
Reputation in Professional World	14	41	19	3	22	1
Professional Interest in Individuals	18	38	19	6	18	1

The comparison ratings are difficult to assess but the factor of "communication flow" seemed to compare least favorably with other colleges. As the rapid growth patterns diminish perhaps the College can direct its energies to solving this problem.

Chapter V

Graduate Comments

What did the holders of the master's degrees discuss?

The study provided information on many facets of the graduate-degree program. The last section,H, reserved for personal comments, was an invitation for individual expression. Responses varied in length from a single line to several paragraphs.

Individuals responded! There were over one-third (38%) who commented about the advanced degree years. When separated by individual topics, the tally soared (49%) because several persons took time to react to a variety of topics which were coded under twenty-one sub-headings. Items were ranked according to the procedure followed in SURVEY - '71.[1] The code follows:

1) Complimentary-which involved only positive, non-suggestive comments (e.g., The campus is beautiful). (respondent #2-70-124-12).

2) Constructive-which included suggestions for changes (e.g., Need more courses that deal with the practical side of education--dealing with problems, comparing curriculums, setting up curriculums, etc.). (respondent #2-662-018-12).

---

[1]SURVEY - '71 OVERVIEW, Follow-up of 1971 Fredonia Graduates, McKee, Helen C., and Mills, Mildred B., 1973, Teacher Education Research Center, State University College, Fredonia, New York.

3) Critical-which included all negative statements (e.g., Phys. ed. facilities, library, Student Union ought to be open 24 hours a day). (respondent #2-138-472-23).

4) Mixed-which included combinations of 1-3. (e.g., Generally, I found my graduate (program) fulfilling and enriching. However, the business forms required were discouraging. I filled out some forms three times because they were lost or the wrong forms had been sent). (respondent #2-418-042-23).

To indicate frequent response areas, the investigators have included an exemplary comment for every ten comments which were made in any given area.

Category: Administration

Under administration, the category, "critical", drew 13 responses (which rated one comment). A three-part statement read:

> Fredonia needs to improve itself in 3 administrative areas: (a) Communication between students and administration--possibly more student-administrative dialogues, (b) Registrar's Office--the quality of advisement and lack of professionalism are two main examples, (c) The Placement Bureau is not efficient. It takes forever to send out credentials when requested. (respondent #1-169-045-43).

Category: Departmental

Departmental comments had a majority of 13 complimentary remarks. The example chosen stated:

> The M.S. program in Geology at SUC, Fredonia, is of the highest caliber. Potential employers may rest assured that those students graduating from Fredonia are intellectually prepared for the responsibilities and challenges of their job. (respondent #1-433-470-32).

Category: Individual and Personal Comments

Under the umbrella of individual and personal comments, there was a wide variety of responses. Complimentary responses (30) reflected the following attitudes:

> I was ready and anxious to spend a year in graduate school after three years as a teacher (which I enjoyed, too), so I put a lot into the experience and got a lot out of it. (respondent #2-426-004-31)

> I was pleased professionally and personally with my education at Fredonia. The faculty and community were hospitable and my time there is remembered fondly. (respondent #1-573-178-92).

> I did enjoy the people I met at Fredonia during my Master's program work, both from the staff at the College and the students in the classes. It was a most refreshing experience! I do feel I gained more from the classes after having had fifteen years teaching experience than if I had entered graduate school fresh from undergraduate study. (respondent #2-267-465-92).

A constructive comment from this same category stated:

> Let's have some courses offered for graduates in the Jamestown area so we don't have to commute. How about workshops for graduate credit....most practical learning happens when participating in meaningful workshops. (respondent #2-402-418-43).

A "mixed" comment, contained constructive and critical items:

> I have filled this form out honestly and hope that it may in some way help to improve the instruction at SUNY, Fredonia. I think the biggest fault at Fredonia is that there is a lack of agreement between faculty and students on what is important to achieve! (respondent #2-609-159-43).

Category: Professors

> At Fredonia, faculty were more interested in students and their progress than I have found faculty at three other campuses. I suspect they are as qualified in scholarship as faculty where I am a Ph.D. candidate now. I know they are more aware of current literary criticism than faculty here. (respondent #2-184-289-21).

> I feel that the quality of the graduate program is mainly dependent on the quality of the professors. I did feel mine were excellent in their interest in students, presentation of material and professionalism. I would have liked a bit more exposure to most current findings in the field and its effect on education today. (respondent #2-249-375-31).

Category: Program

For this report, it was felt that a general statement would be more appropriate than a specific comment. It was a difficult item to find... most of the graduates focused on individuals.

> I enjoyed the graduate courses at Fredonia more than the undergraduate courses. There was more academic freedom and less busy work and boring lectures in grad courses. (respondent #2-570-416-33).

Table 16 provides the open-end responses under twenty-one categories.

Table 16. Open-End Responses

Item H: General Categories	1 Complimentary	2 Constructive	3 Critical	4 Mixed (1-3)	Total
Administration	-	-	13	-	13
Advisement	-	1	5	2	8
Curriculum	-	6	-	2	8
Departmental Comments	13	4	5	3	25
Facilities	1	1	-	-	2
Graduate Assistantships	1	2	-	-	3
Graduate Office	-	-	8	-	8
Individual and Personal Comments	30	15	4	11	60
Instruction	6	1	3	3	13
Library	2	1	-	-	3
Overview	3	-	1	1	5
Placement	1	-	6	1	8
Professors	18	-	1	1	20
Program	10	6	3	4	23
Registrar	-	-	4	-	4
Registration	-	-	3	-	3
Requirements	-	3	5	-	8
Services	-	-	4	-	4
SURVEY	5	2	-	1	8
Transfers	-	-	1	1	2
Undergraduate Years	1	-	-	-	1

The responses given by the graduate population indicated interest in all phases of college life. In recent years, graduate students have been included on many college committees. A Graduate Council, made up of master degree candidates, might be an appropriate way to encourage interaction with this portion of the student body.

Chapter VI

RETROSPECT

What did those who had been awarded the master's degree think of SUC, Fredonia?

Graduate students who attended SUC, Fredonia, were as interested in the College and its development as the undergraduate population.[1]

Advanced degree graduates are usually more mature, hold jobs and nave financial security. As established members of the community, the responses of this population should be given serious consideration. The group took the time to respond and react. Will the College at Fredonia respond and react....to further improve the quality of education which it provides?

The target group (N = 708) cared enough to provide a two-thirds (66%) response. Another indicator of general interest was that almost three-fourths (73%) of the respondents asked for a copy of the report.

The group wanted to express themselves and welcomed the opportunity to be heard. To quote one determined person:

> Sorry this is sloppy and later. I am writing with a broken arm. (respondent #2-690-254-01).

---

[1] SURVEY - '71 OVERVIEW Follow-up of 1971 Fredonia Graduates. McKee, Helen C., and Mills, Mildred B.

SURVEY - '71 A FOLLOW-UP of 1971 FREDONIA GRADUATES. McKee, Helen C., Bauman, Daniel J., and Mills, Mildred B.

The respondents offered many ideas for change and suggested implications of these changes. Ideas ranged from major problem areas to petty irritations. Areas which were mentioned most frequently were:

college personnel
student body
programs
curricular offerings
communication lines

Included in the comments were glowing tributes to Fredonia and to individuals (faculty and staff) who "touched" the lives of the graduates as students.

The growth of the college, from the days of the Academy to the present organizational form, has not diminished the feelings for the college. Grassroots held. Students cared, on the graduate level, and were loyal to their Alma Mater.

Furthermore, there was a prevailing aura that "Fredonia....it is unique."

Two open-ended statements seemed to express the general attitude of the target group:

> My time spent at Fredonia was the best time of my life. It was a time of personal and academic growth that prepared me fully to tackle a teaching job confidently and also to become an actively aware citizen in the world. (respondent #2-356-399-23).

> I suspect the campus, as a whole, underestimates its role as a very able educator. A more positive approach to education and professional status may be in order. (respondent #1-536-207-43).

Appendix A

Entry Conditions for Undergraduate Degree Programs Not Specifically Identified

Entry conditions for the undergraduate degree included the category, "other." Under this heading, were the following items and the number of individuals within the classifications.

Categories: Entered College after . . .	Number
Army and 7 Years Employment	1
Marriage, Family, and as a Transfer of 4-Year College	1
Interrupted Education After Entering Direct from High School	1
3 Years Normal and 8 Years Teaching (for Certification)	1
Family (19 Years Lapse)	1
Community College and Transfer of 4-Year College	1
Business Career	1
Starting College Courses while in High School (3-1-3)	1
Completing One College Degree	2
Time Lapse Between Entering and Completing Degree	3
Transferring from 4-Year College	7
	20 (4%)

Appendix B

Colleges, Other Than Fredonia, Attended for

Undergraduate Degree

New York State Public Colleges

Name of College		Number of Students Who Earned Degrees
City College of New York		1
SUNY units:	Brockport	3
	Geneseo	2
	Oswego	1
	Potsdam	4

New York State Private Colleges

Name of College	Number of Students Who Earned Degrees
Cornell University	1
Elmira College	1
Houghton College	1
Niagara University, Niagara Falls	1
St. Bonaventure	1

Out of State

State	College	Number of Students Who Earned Degrees
California:	University of California, Santa Barbara	1
	San Francisco, California	1
District of Columbia:	Washington	1
Florida:	Miami	2
Georgia:	Emory, Atlanta	1
Illinois:	Illinois Northwestern University, Bloomington	1

Out of State

State	College	Number of Students Who Earned Degrees
Iowa	Ames	1
Kansas:	Baker University	1
Kentucky:	Asbury	1
	Kentucky	1
	Murray State University	1
Massachusetts:	Boston	1
	Univ. Massachusetts	1
	Nicholas College, Dudley	1
Michigan:	Eastern Michigan	1
	MSU, Michigan State	1
	WMU, Kalamazoo	1
Minnesota:	St. Paul	1
New Hampshire:	New Hampshire	1
North Carolina:	Duke University	1
Ohio:	Miami University	1
	Oberlin	1
	Ohio University	4
	Univ. of Cincinnati	1
	St. John's College, Cleveland	1
	Youngstown	1
Pennsylvania:	Alleghany	2
	Beaver Falls	1
	Clarion State	4
	Edinboro	3
	Erie, Pa.	3
	Gannon	4
	Indiana University	4
	Juniata	1
	Lafayette	1
	Lockhaven State	2
	Mansfield State	3
	Marywood	1

Out of State

State	College	Number of Students Who Earned Degrees
Pennsylvania:	Mercyhurst	1
	Pennsylvania State	2
	Slippery Rock State	1
	West Chester	1
Tennessee:	Nashville	1

Outside Continental U.S.

Austria	University of Vienna	1
Iran	Tabriz University	1
Puerto Rico		6
Republic of China, Taiwan		1

Appendix C

STATE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE • FREDONIA, NEW YORK 14063

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

Dear Graduate:

Criticism of higher education has become a major concern of all colleges. State University College at Fredonia is no exception. To complete a composite of our advanced-degree programs, we are seeking reactions to your experiences while earning your master's degree. Your reactions to all aspects of involvement while at SUC, Fredonia, are important as we consider the graduate offerings.

Both the college community and prospective candidates will benefit from your response. Please complete and return the Graduate-Degree Questionnaire and contribute to the success of future programs at Fredonia. Your response will be coded to protect your identity.

Thanks and continued best wishes.

Cordially,

Dallas K. Beal,
President, SUC, Fredonia

DKB:MTA
Enc.

. GRADUATE-DEGREE SURVEY

Please complete the following:

Name _____

Address _____

_____

_____

I. D. Code

I. D. Code

Undergraduate Program

Check the items that apply to you.

A. I entered college for an undergraduate degree:

1. a) _____ direct from high school

   b) _____ as a "delayed" entrant

   c) _____ as a transfer from community college

   d) _____ as a graduate from community college

   e) _____ from armed services

   f) _____ other _____

B. My undergraduate degree was earned at:

2. a) _____ SUC, Fredonia

   b) _____ SUC, another unit

   c) _____ Private college (New York State)

   d) _____ College (out of state)

   _____
   Please indicate location

   e) _____ College outside continental U. S.

   _____
   Please indicate location

C. After earning the undergraduate degree, I enrolled in the master's program:

3. a) _____ within the year

b) _____ 1 - 5 years later

c) _____ 6 - 10 years later

d) _____ 11 - 15 years later

e) _____ 16 (or more) years later

D. Please circle one which best describes the area in which you live:

4. a) Rural farm area

b) Small city or town of fewer than 10,000

c) Medium-sized city (up to 50,000)

d) Suburb of medium-sized city

e) Large city (100,000 or over)

f) Suburb of large city

Please circle one which best describes the area in which you work:

5. a) Rural farm area

b) Small city or town of fewer than 10,000

c) Medium-sized city (up to 50,000)

d) Suburb of medium-sized city

e) Large city (100,000 or over)

f) Suburb of large city

College Selection

E. Please circle the appropriate response in each row.

Reasons for attending SUC, Fredonia, for the graduate program were the:	Major influence (1)	Minor influence (2)	Not relevant (3)
6. strong program in my major area	1	2	3
7. publications of professors in my area	1	2	3
8. reputation of professors for quality education	1	2	3
9. variety of teaching techniques used	1	2	3
10. credentials of professors	1	2	3
11. recommendations of alumni	1	2	3
12. professional reputation of SUC, Fredonia, alumni	1	2	3
13. contacts with representatives of SUC, Fredonia	1	2	3
14. media articles or publications about SUC, Fredonia	1	2	3
15. attitudes of peers towards SUC, Fredonia	1	2	3
16. number of peers who attend(ed) Fredonia	1	2	3
17. family recommendations	1	2	3
18. proximity of college	1	2	3
19. cost factors	1	2	3
20. availability of waivers and/or vouchers	1	2	3
21. possibility of graduate assistantships	1	2	3
22. requirements for matriculation were reasonable	1	2	3
23. extensive physical facilities which were available	1	2	3
24. experience in undergraduate program at Fredonia	1	2	3

College Years

F. Classes	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Not applicable
25. Did you receive encouragement from professors during the master's program?	1	2	3	4
26. Did you receive practical knowledge which further prepared you for your position?	1	2	3	4
27. Was the theoretical aspect of subject matter stressed?	1	2	3	4
28. Did you have a variety of learning experiences?	1	2	3	4
29. Were there guest speakers?	1	2	3	4
30. Was there class participation?	1	2	3	4
31. Did class sessions, in general, consist of lectures?	1	2	3	4
32. Was there an opportunity for frequent class discussion?	1	2	3	4
33. Were class assignments meaningful?	1	2	3	4
34. Do you feel that many assignments were busy work?	1	2	3	4

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Not applicable
Materials & Equipment				
35. Were audio-visual materials, including films, used?	1	2	3	4
36. Were library facilities available when you needed them?	1	2	3	4
37. Did you use the library for class preparation?	1	2	3	4
38. Were library materials sufficient for course requirements?	1	2	3	4
39. Were library materials sufficient for course enrichment?	1	2	3	4
40. Were you satisfied with administrative services?	1	2	3	4
41. Were you satisfied with guidance or advisement service?	1	2	3	4
Curricular				
42. Was there a variety of course offerings in your field each semester?	1	2	3	4
43. Were you hindered or limited by the program requirements at the time you were earning your degree?	1	2	3	4
44. Did you attend courses during the day?	1	2	3	4
45. Were off-campus courses taken?	1	2	3	4
46. Did you have to travel (over 10 miles one way) to attend sessions?	1	2	3	4

	Frequently	Occasionally	Never	Not applicable
Social				
47. Were you actively involved in extracurricular college activities while working on the master's degree?	1	2	3	4
48. Were you actively involved in clubs on campus? . .	1	2	3	4
49. Did you attend lectures/seminars?	1	2	3	4
50. Did you attend campus-sponsored social events? . .	1	2	3	4
Facilities				
51. Was the available housing adequate?	1	2	3	4
52. Were housing personnel helpful?	1	2	3	4
53. Were the food facilities adequate?	1	2	3	4

Please circle the correct answer.	Yes	No
54. Did you have a graduate assistantship?	1	2
a) If so, was the position accurately described?. . .	1	2
b) If so, was the stipend adequate?	1	2
55. Did you receive a salary adjustment when master's degree was awarded?.	1	2
56. Did you change your professional position after receiving the master's degree?	1	2
57. Do you feel that you have used course material to advantage in your position?	1	2

		Yes	No
58.	Did you find new interests and ideas developing from material of the master's program?	1	2
	Add any additional comments which you wish to make about Fredonia's graduate program.		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		
59.	a) Have you enrolled, or do you intend to enroll, for further course work?	1	2
	b) If so, will you enroll at SUC, Fredonia?	1	2
60.	Do you intend to enroll for a post-master's degree? . .	1	2
61.	Was the major reason for earning a master's degree the state mandate (30 hours in 5 years)?	1	2
62.	Did you earn the master's degree in the same curricular area as your bachelor degree?	1	2
	If you changed curricular area, please indicate the change and the reason for it.		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		
	_____		

G. How does SUC, Fredonia, compare to other colleges that you have visited or attended? Please circle one.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No basis for comparison
63. Conditions of buildings and classrooms	1	2	3	4	5
64. Equipment availability	1	2	3	4	5
65. Extracurricular facilities	1	2	3	4	5
66. Job placement of graduates	1	2	3	4	5
67. Library facilities	1	2	3	4	5
68. Quality of academic instruction	1	2	3	4	5
69. Quality of advisement	1	2	3	4	5
70. Communication flow	1	2	3	4	5
71. Tutorial assistance	1	2	3	4	5
72. Reputation in community	1	2	3	4	5
73. Reputation in professional world	1	2	3	4	5
74. Professional interest in individuals	1	2	3	4	5

H. This space is reserved for your personal comments.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

☐ Please check here if you want a copy of the report.

Thank you. We appreciate your efforts.

Helen C. McKee

Daniel J. Bauman

Gerald T. Holmes